

REMARKS

Claims 20-32 are presently pending. Claims 1-19 were rejected and are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 20-32 are added.

Claims 1-5, 8-9, 12-14, and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mesarovic. Claims 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Mesarovic in view of Ishito.

Newly added claim 20 recites, among other limitations, “one or more audio decoding circuits for performing one or more functions on a frame of encoded audio data, wherein the one or more audio decoding functions comprises prediction decoding; a memory for storing results of the one or more audio decoding functions comprising prediction decoding on the frame of encoded data; a bitstream demultiplexer for bitstream demultiplexing the frame of encoded audio data; and wherein the memory stores the results of bitstream demultiplexing the encoded audio data over at least a portion of the results of the one or more audio decoding functions comprising prediction decoding.”

Assignee respectfully submits that claim 20 is allowable, at least because neither Mesarovic or Ishito teach the claimed “wherein the memory stores the results of bitstream demultiplexing the encoded audio data over at least a portion of the results of the one or more audio decoding functions comprising prediction decoding.” Examiner has indicated that Mesarovic at [0055] teaches “the 1024 samples from the previous block, which were kept in data memory as ‘history data’, are overwritten with the second half of the IMDCT output after layable PCM samples 510 are produced. Collectively, blocks 504, 506, and 508 are referred to as the filterbank 485. The second half of the current block is again used as ‘history data’ in overlap-and-add step of the next cycle”. However, the foregoing clearly does not teach “wherein the memory stores the results of bitstream demultiplexing the encoded audio data over at least a portion of the results of the one or more audio decoding functions comprising prediction decoding.”

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reason, Assignee respectfully submits that independent claims 20 and 28 are allowable, as well as dependent claims 21-25.

Claim 26 recites, among other limitations, “a first audio decoding circuit for performing a first audio function on a frame of encoded audio data, wherein the first audio decoding circuit is selected from a group consisting of an inverse quantizer for

inverse quantizing the frame of encoded audio data, a bitstream demultiplexer for demultiplexing the frame of encoded audio data, and a filter bank for filtering the frame of encoded audio data; a memory for storing outputs of the first audio decoding circuit; a second audio decoding circuit for performing a second audio function on a frame of encoded audio data, wherein the second audio decoding circuit is selected from a group consisting of a bitstream demultiplexer for demultiplexing the frame of encoded audio data, a filter bank for filtering the frame of encoded audio data, and an intensity coupler for intensity coupling the frame of encoded audio data; and wherein the memory stores the outputs of the second audio decoding circuit over at least a portion of the results of the first audio decoding circuit”. It is respectfully submitted that Mesarovic and Ishito do not teach “wherein the memory stores the outputs of the second audio decoding circuit over at least a portion of the results of the first audio decoding circuit” “wherein the first audio decoding circuit is selected from a group consisting of an inverse quantizer for inverse quantizing the frame of encoded audio data, a bitstream demultiplexer for demultiplexing the frame of encoded audio data, and a filter bank for filtering the frame of encoded audio data” and “wherein the second audio decoding circuit is selected from a group consisting of a bitstream demultiplexer for demultiplexing the frame of encoded audio data, a filter bank for filtering the frame of encoded audio data, and an intensity coupler for intensity coupling the frame of encoded audio data” as is claimed.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reason, claim 26 and dependent claim 27 are allowable.


CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully submits that each of the pending claims are allowable and Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fees or credit

overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: February 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MDL', is written over a horizontal line.

Mirut Dalal
Reg. No. 44,052
Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661

Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100